



SPECIAL REPORT



TIME AFTER TIME, REPUBLICANS VOTE **AGAINST** THE INTERESTS OF WORKING FAMILIES

An Overview of Key Votes in the 106th Congress to Date



House Democratic Policy Committee
RICHARD A. GEPHARDT
House Democratic Leader
September 8, 2000

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>page</u>
Key Votes on Education	2
Key Votes on the Environment	9
Key Votes on Managed Care Reform	18
Key Votes on Medicare Prescription Coverage	20
Key Votes on Minimum Wage	22
Key Anti-Crime Votes	24
Key Votes on Campaign Finance Reform	28

TIME AFTER TIME, REPUBLICANS VOTE AGAINST THE INTERESTS OF WORKING FAMILIES

An Overview of Key Votes in the 106th Congress To Date

As this DPC Special Report will show, time after time in the 106th Congress, House Republicans have voted against the interests of working families. This Special Report provides an overview of key votes in the following seven areas of importance to America's working families:

- ! Education;
- ! The Environment;
- ! Managed Care Reform;
- ! Medicare Prescription Coverage;
- ! Minimum Wage;
- ! Crime; and
- ! Campaign Finance Reform.

It is because of their dismal voting record that this GOP 106th Congress has failed to produce real results for America's families.

For example in the area of education, instead of sitting down with the Administration and working out bipartisan proposals to improve the nation's public schools, the GOP voting record shows Republicans voting to block key education initiatives (such as Class Size Reduction and School Renovation) and promote block grants that reduce accountability.

In the area of the environment, instead of developing bipartisan solutions with the Administration to improve the environment, the GOP voting record shows Republicans voting to underfund key environmental programs and promote damaging anti-environmental riders.

In the area of prescription drugs for seniors, instead of developing a bipartisan plan to provide real coverage to seniors, the House GOP leadership pushed through on a party-line vote a sham proposal – supported by the big drug companies – that fails to provide all of America's seniors access to an affordable, reliable prescription drug benefit.

In certain areas, Democrats have been successful in working with Republicans willing to defy the House GOP leadership to pass important bipartisan legislation, such as the strong, enforceable Norwood-Dingell Patients' Bill of Rights and the Shays-Meehan Campaign Finance Reform bill. However, the House and Senate GOP leadership have spent the last several months ensuring that the Norwood-Dingell and Shays-Meehan bills not become law.

In sum, the GOP voting record over the last two years highlights how Republicans have squandered the last two years – failing to produce achievements for working families.

KEY VOTES ON EDUCATION

Votes on Budget Plans

1999 Vote #76 – March 25, 1999 – GOP Rejected Democratic Substitute Budget Resolution That Called for \$51 Billion More for Education Than GOP Budget Over 10 Years

In March 1999, House Republicans rejected – by a vote of 173 to 250 – the Democratic substitute budget resolution. This Democratic budget resolution did not include the Republicans' damaging cuts in education programs. Instead, the Democratic budget resolution called for \$2.6 billion more for education in FY 2000 than the GOP budget. Over time, the difference between the Democratic and Republican budgets got even greater. Over ten years, the Democratic budget called for \$51 billion more for education than the GOP budget.

1999 Vote #77 – March 25, 1999 – GOP Adopted Budget Resolution That Called For Cutting Education Funding in Inflation-Adjusted Terms by 18% by 2009

In March 1999, House Republicans adopted – by a narrow margin of 221 to 208 – the Republican budget resolution which called for a massive \$778 billion tax cut over a ten-year period. To pay for their massive tax cut, Republicans called for significant cuts in investments in key domestic priorities – including education. Specifically, the budget resolution called for cutting education funding by \$1.2 billion in FY 2000 below a freeze at the FY 1999 level. In addition, the budget resolution called for cutting education funding in real (inflation-adjusted) terms by an astounding 18% by the year FY 2009.

1999 Vote #85 – April 14, 1999 – GOP Adopted Budget Resolution Conference Report That Called for Cutting Education Funding in Inflation-Adjusted Terms by 13% by 2009

In April 1999, House Republicans adopted – by a narrow margin of 220 to 208 – the Republican budget resolution conference report which also called for a massive \$778 billion tax cut over a ten-year period. Once again, to pay for this tax cut, Republicans called for significant cuts in investments in key domestic priorities – including education. Specifically, the conference report called for cutting education funding by \$200 million in FY 2000 below a freeze at the FY 1999 level. In addition, the conference report called for cutting education funding in real (inflation-adjusted) terms by a stunning 13% by the year FY 2009.

2000 Vote #74 – March 23, 2000 – GOP Rejected Democratic Substitute Budget Resolution That Called for \$21 Billion More For Education Than GOP Budget Over 5 Years

In 2000, the Republicans proposed a five-year budget resolution rather than the ten-year budget plan they proposed in 1999 (probably in order to make the GOP tax cut sound smaller, since the ten-year \$778 billion GOP tax cut passed and vetoed in 1999 had proved unpopular with the public).

In March 2000, House Republicans rejected – by a vote of 184 to 233 – the Democratic substitute budget resolution. The Democratic budget resolution called for \$4.8 billion more for education in FY 2001 than the Republican budget – enough to fully fund the President's request. Over five years, the Democratic budget plan would have invested \$21 billion more in education than the Republicans. This funding would have provided for investments in improving teacher quality, reducing class size, requiring accountability and higher standards, increasing access to higher education, and modernizing public schools.

2000 Vote #75 – March 23, 2000 – GOP Adopted Budget Resolution That Called for Cutting Spending in Inflation-Adjusted Terms for Higher Education, Training & Social Services by 9% by 2005

Also in March 2000, House Republicans adopted – by a narrow margin of 211 to 207 – the Republican budget resolution which called for a massive tax cut of up to \$200 billion over the next five years. This year, the GOP budget resolution provided a small increase, mostly to cover inflation, for elementary and secondary education over five years. However, the GOP resolution froze funding at the FY 2000 level for five years for all higher education assistance, job training, and social services programs. This represents a real cut in purchasing power of about 9% by FY 2005. Under this cut, about 316,000 fewer low-income students would receive Pell Grants to attend college and Head Start would have to cut services to more than 40,000 children and their families.

2000 Vote #125–April 13, 2000–GOP Adopted Budget Resolution Conference Report That Also Called for Cutting Spending in Inflation-Adjusted Terms for Higher Education, Training & Social Services by 9% by 2005

In April 2000, House Republicans adopted – by a narrow margin of 220 to 208 – the GOP budget resolution conference report which called for a massive tax cut of up to \$175 billion over the next five years. Like the House-passed resolution, the conference report froze funding at the FY 2000 level for five years for all higher education assistance, job training, and social services programs. This represents a real cut in purchasing power of about 9% by FY 2005. Under this cut, as in the House-passed resolution, about 316,000 fewer low-income students would receive Pell Grants to attend college and Head Start would have to cut services to more than 40,000 children and their families.

Votes on Education Appropriations Bills

1999 Vote #549 – October 28, 1999 – GOP Adopted the FY 2000 Labor-HHS-Education “Conference Report”

Throughout the spring and summer of 1999, the House GOP leadership failed to bring to the House Floor a Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill. Finally, in October, House Republicans brought a “conference report” on the Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill to the Floor despite the fact that the bill itself had never been considered!

Specifically, on October 28, 1999, House Republicans passed – by a narrow margin of 218 to 211 – a GOP FY 2000 Labor-HHS-Education appropriations “conference report.” This “conference report” would have:

- ! Gutted the 1998 bipartisan commitment to hire 100,000 teachers to reduce class size in the early grades – by block-granting the initiative with other education programs and cutting out the additional \$200 million requested by the Administration to hire 8,000 new teachers in 2000, in addition to the 29,000 teachers hired in 1999.
- ! Funded 3,400 fewer after-school centers serving 950,000 fewer children than requested by the Administration;
- ! Denied \$94 million requested for educational technology initiatives, including funds to establish computer learning centers in 260 low-income communities; to implement technology plans in 220 school districts; and to improve technology instruction in 4,700 middle schools.
- ! Cut \$189 million in Title I funds below the Administration’s request, which would have helped schools hire an additional 5,400 Title I teachers to serve 290,000 disadvantaged children;
- ! Cut \$26 million, or 9%, from the Administration’s \$286 million request for the Reading Excellence Program, denying services to improve the reading skills of an estimated 100,000 children; and
- ! Denied \$189 million of the Administration’s request for the Hispanic Education Initiative.

Fortunately, on November 3, 1999, President Clinton vetoed this conference report. Ultimately, the Republicans had to back down and agree to fund several of the Administration’s key education initiatives, in the Omnibus Appropriations bill the President signed on November 29, 1999.

2000 Vote #273 – June 14, 2000 – GOP Passed the FY 2001 Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations Bill, Cutting the President’s Education Request by \$3.5 Billion

On June 14, 2000, House Republicans passed – by a narrow margin of 217 to 214 – H.R. 4577, the GOP Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill for FY 2001. **This House GOP bill was \$3.5 billion below the President’s request for education programs.** Some of the most objectionable cuts in the President’s education budget contained in the GOP bill included:

- ! No guaranteed funding was provided for continuing the Class Size Reduction Initiative to place 100,000 new, highly-qualified teachers in our schools;
- ! No funding was provided for President Clinton's school renovation proposal, which would help pay for urgently needed safety and health repairs;
- ! No funding was provided for elementary school counselors;
- ! \$1 billion was cut from the President's request for targeted investments to improve teacher quality and recruit new teachers;
- ! \$400 million (or 40%) was cut from the President's request for after-school programs, thereby funding 3,100 fewer after-school centers and serving 1.6 million fewer children than requested;
- ! \$600 million was cut from the President's request for Head Start, meaning 53,000 fewer children would participate in the program;
- ! \$416 million was cut from the President's request for Title I, eliminating or reducing Title I reading and math assistance for up to an additional 650,000 disadvantaged children;
- ! \$26 million was cut from the President's request for the Reading Excellence Act, denying services to improve the reading skills of an estimated 100,000 children;
- ! \$125 million (or 38%) was cut from the President's request to expand college preparation under GEAR UP, denying services to an estimated 644,000 low-income middle and high school students; and
- ! \$68 million (or 68%) was cut from the President's request of \$100 million to help close the Digital Divide in low-income communities.

2000 Vote #415 – July 19, 2000 – GOP Rejected Instructing Conferees To Insist on More Education Funding & Dedicated Funding for Class Size Reduction & School Renovation

On July 19, 2000, House Republicans rejected – by a narrow margin of 207 to 212 – a motion to instruct conferees on the FY 2001 Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations bill that would have insisted on the Senate-passed levels for overall education funding – which was \$3.1 billion over the House-passed amount – as well as the Senate-passed levels for such key programs as Pell Grants (\$384 million over the House-passed level) and Head Start (\$600 million over the House-passed level). Furthermore, the motion instructed conferees to disagree with Senate provisions which denied the President's request for dedicated resources for the Class Size Reduction Initiative and the School Renovation Initiative.

Votes on Education Authorization Bills

1999 Vote #36 – March 10, 1999 – GOP Rejected Allowing A Vote on a Full Seven-Year Authorization of the Class Size Reduction Initiative

In March 1999, House Republicans voted down an attempt by Democrats to bring up a full seven-year authorization of the Class Size Reduction Initiative, by a vote of 217 to 198 (on a Democratic effort to defeat the previous question on the rule), during consideration of the Ed-Flex bill. This amendment would have provided the full authorization of \$12.4 billion over a seven-year period (FY 1999-FY 2005) for the Class Size Reduction Initiative in order to help local school districts recruit and hire 100,000 new, qualified teachers in order to

reduce class size in the early grades. This seven-year program would succeed in reducing the average class size in the early grades nationwide to 18 students. And yet the Republicans would not even allow this seven-year authorization to come up for a vote.

1999 Vote #39 – March 11, 1999 – GOP Rejected Adding Important Accountability Provisions to Ed-Flex Bill

Also, in March 1999, House Republicans defeated – by a vote of 196 to 228 – an amendment offered by Rep. Miller (D-CA) and Rep. Kildee (D-MI) which would have added important accountability provisions to the “Ed-Flex” bill, which expanded nationwide the Ed-Flex pilot program in 12 states. The Ed-Flex program provides states certain flexibility in using federal education funds. A 1998 GAO report had found that, “Many Ed-Flex states have not established any goals.” In response to the GAO report, the Miller-Kildee amendment would have required states, in order to participate in Ed-Flex, to have in place a plan for assessing students’ performance. The amendment would also have required states to have a goal of closing gaps in achievement between economically disadvantaged children and their peers. And yet the Republicans rejected these provisions to increase the accountability of federal education dollars.

1999 Vote #319 – July 20, 1999 – GOP Rejected Democratic Effort to Double Funding for Teacher Training and Double Funding for Class Size Reduction

On July 20, 1999, House Republicans rejected – by a narrow margin of 207 to 217 – a Democratic substitute to the GOP “Teacher Quality” Block Grant Bill. This GOP bill would eliminate three key education programs (Class Size Reduction Initiative, Eisenhower Teacher Training, and Goals 2000 School Reform) by consolidating them into an underfunded block grant of \$2 billion a year. By contrast, the Democratic substitute would have placed a higher priority both on teacher training and on class size reduction than the GOP bill – by calling for doubling funding for teacher training over five years (authorizing \$1.5 billion for teacher training in FY 2000, rising to \$3 billion by FY 2004) and doubling funding for class size reduction over six years (authorizing \$1.5 billion for class size reduction in FY 2000, rising to \$3 billion by FY 2005).

1999 Vote #320 – July 20, 1999 – GOP Passed “Teacher Quality” Block Grant Bill

Also on July 20, 1999, House Republicans passed – by a vote of 239 to 185 – their “Teacher Quality” Block Grant bill. This GOP bill would eliminate three key education programs (Class Size Reduction, Eisenhower Teacher Training, and Goals 2000 School Reform) by rolling them into a block grant and would also underfund the block grant at \$2 billion a year. Under the bill, there would be no guarantee that even one federal dollar went for class size reduction. Like other GOP block grant proposals, this block grant would reduce the accountability of federal education dollars – moving instead in the direction of the discredited notion of general revenue sharing. The Senate has not acted on the bill.

1999 Vote #521 – October 21, 1999 – A Majority of House Republicans Voted To Divert Portion of Title I Funds Into Private School Vouchers

On October 21, 1999, nearly three-fourths of House Republicans voted for an amendment

by Majority Leader Dick Armey to undermine public education by dismantling Title I and turning the program's public school grants into private school vouchers, when the House was considering H.R. 2, Title I Reauthorization. The Armey amendment would have siphoned scarce education funds out of public schools – where 90% of our children are educated – and into private schools for a select few. The vast majority of Republicans voted to abandon, rather than improve, the public schools. Private school vouchers have long been a priority of the Christian Coalition and the Eagle Forum. Fortunately, despite the support of the GOP leadership, the Armey amendment was defeated by a vote of 166 to 257 – with 204 Democrats, 52 Republicans, and 1 Independent voting NO.

1999 Vote #523 – October 21, 1999 – A Majority of House Republicans Voted Against Increasing the Authorization for Title I

Also on October 21, 1999, 178 House Republicans voted against an amendment by Rep. Roemer (D-IN) to increase the annual authorization for Title I funding from \$8.4 billion to \$9.9 billion – including all of the top GOP leaders (the Speaker usually does not vote) as follows: House Majority Leader Dick Armey, House Majority Whip Tom DeLay, House GOP Conference Chair J.C. Watts, and House Chief Deputy Majority Whip Roy Blunt. Title I is the major vehicle for targeting federal funds to help elementary and secondary schools improve the academic performance of poor and disadvantaged students – with a focus on providing assistance in reading and math. Fortunately, despite the opposition of the GOP leadership, the Roemer amendment was adopted by a vote of 243 to 181 – with 203 Democrats, 39 Republicans, and 1 Independent voting YEA.

1999 Vote #531 – October 21, 1999 – GOP Rejected Recommitting “Anti-Accountability” Act to Focus on Class Size Reduction, School Modernization, & Teacher Quality

Also on October 21, 1999, House Republicans rejected – by a narrow margin of 201 to 217 – a motion to recommit H.R. 2300, the GOP “Anti-Accountability” Block Grant bill with instructions to promptly report the bill back to the House “in a manner that addresses the need to help communities to reduce class size, to modernize our nation's crumbling and overcrowded public schools, and to ensure that teachers are highly qualified.” This motion to recommit would have redirected the ill-considered GOP block grant bill in order to address the three highest education priorities of parents, teachers, and local communities across the country: reducing the average class size in order to raise student achievement, modernizing and repairing crumbling school facilities, and raising the quality of teachers.

1999 Vote #532 – October 21, 1999 – GOP Passed “Anti-Accountability” Block Grant Bill (the so-called “Straight A’s” Act)

Finally, also on October 21, 1999, House Republicans passed – by a narrow margin of 213 to 208 – the highly-controversial H.R. 2300, the so-called “Straight A’s” bill, which should be called the “Anti-Accountability” Act. Unfortunately, this GOP proposal is a back-door block grant that transforms more than three-quarters of federal education programs (including Title I, class size reduction, safe and drug-free schools, and comprehensive school reform) into general aid to the states. There is no assurance that the money would go to schools that need money, and no real assurance that school districts and states obtain results in their efforts to provide a high-quality education. Instead, Straight A’s represents an irresponsible blank check to the states. (As will be seen below, before it was passed, the GOP leadership had to scale back the bill’s block grant provisions to apply only in a 10-state pilot program, rather than nationwide.)

In a highly embarrassing setback for the House GOP leadership, it turned out that this highly controversial bill – which the House GOP leadership had labeled the centerpiece of the GOP education agenda for the 106th Congress – did not even have the votes to pass on the House Floor – due to the opposition of House GOP moderates. Here is how CQ Weekly (10/23/99) described this embarrassing setback for the House GOP leadership:

“GOP leaders were forced to significantly scale back a bill (H.R. 2300) that would have let states convert Title I and a host of other programs that make up the bulk of federal elementary and secondary aid into block grants. Republicans had unveiled the ‘Straight A’s’ measure, backed by self-described family values groups such as the Family Research Council with great fanfare this summer, intending to make it the focus of their public relations message. They ran into a problem. They did not have the votes to pass it. Rep. Michael Castle of Delaware ... joined other Republican moderates in opposing the bill, saying it could undermine services to Title I students.”

As was mentioned above, in order to obtain the votes to pass H.R. 2300, at the last minute GOP leaders had to modify the bill – providing that the bill’s block grant provisions would only operate in a 10-state pilot program, rather than nationwide as under the original GOP bill. The GOP proposal now seems dead for the year – as the Republican Senate has not acted on the bill.

KEY VOTES ON THE ENVIRONMENT

Votes on Budget Plans

1999 Vote #76 – March 25, 1999 – GOP Rejected Democratic Substitute Budget Resolution That Called for \$37 Billion More for Environmental Programs Than GOP Budget Over 10 Years

In March 1999, House Republicans rejected – by a vote of 173 to 250 – the Democratic substitute budget resolution. This Democratic budget resolution did not include the Republicans' damaging cuts in environmental and natural resources programs. Instead, the Democratic budget resolution called for \$1.6 billion more for natural resources and environmental programs in FY 2000 than the GOP budget. Over time, the difference between the Democratic and Republican budgets got even greater. Over ten years, the Democratic budget called for \$37 billion more for environmental and natural resources programs than the GOP budget.

1999 Vote #77–March 25, 1999–GOP Adopted Budget Resolution That Called for Cutting Funding for Environmental Programs In Inflation-Adjusted Terms by 24% by 2009.

In March 1999, House Republicans adopted – by a narrow margin of 221 to 208 – the Republican budget resolution which called for a massive \$778 billion tax cut over a ten-year period. To pay for their massive tax cut, Republicans called for significant cuts in investments in key domestic priorities – including environmental programs. Specifically, the budget resolution called for cutting funding for environmental and natural resources programs by \$1.3 billion in FY 2000 below a freeze at the FY 1999 level. In addition, the budget resolution called for cutting environmental funding in real (inflation-adjusted) terms by 24% by the year FY 2009.

1999 Vote #85 – April 14, 1999 – GOP Adopted Budget Resolution Conference Report That Called for Cutting Funding for Environmental Protection in Inflation-Adjusted Terms by 25% by 2009

In April 1999, House Republicans adopted – by a narrow margin of 220 to 208 – the Republican budget resolution conference report which also called for a massive \$778 billion tax cut over a ten-year period. Once again, to pay for this tax cut, Republicans called for significant cuts in investments in key domestic priorities – including environmental programs. Like the House-passed resolution, the conference report called for cutting funding for environmental and natural resources programs by \$1.3 billion in FY 2000 below a freeze at the FY 1999 level. In addition, the conference report called for cutting funding for environmental and natural resources programs in real (inflation-adjusted) terms by 25% by the year 2009.

2000 Vote #74 – March 23, 2000 – GOP Rejected Democratic Substitute Budget Resolution That Called for \$8 Billion More for Environmental Programs Than GOP Budget Over 5 Years

In 2000, the Republicans proposed a five-year budget resolution rather than the ten-year budget plan they proposed in 1999 (probably in order to make the GOP tax cut sound smaller, since the ten-year \$778 billion GOP tax cut passed and vetoed in 1999 had proved unpopular with the public.)

In March 2000, House Republicans rejected – by a vote of 184 to 233 – the Democratic substitute budget resolution. The Democratic budget resolution would have invested \$8 billion more in environmental and natural resources programs than the Republicans over the next five years. This funding would have provided for increased investments in such programs as assistance to states and localities for wastewater and drinking water treatment plants, the Lands Legacy Initiative, and upgrading facilities in the National Parks.

2000 Vote #75 – March 23, 2000 – GOP Adopted Budget Resolution That Called for Cutting Funding for Environmental Programs in Inflation-Adjusted Terms by 10% by 2005

In March 2000, House Republicans adopted – by a narrow margin of 211 to 207– the Republican budget resolution which called for a massive tax cut of up to \$200 billion over the next five years. For FY 2001, the budget resolution called for cutting funding for environmental and natural resources programs in real (inflation-adjusted) terms by nearly \$500 million – or by 2%. Under the budget resolution, these cuts in purchasing power would grow over the five years. By FY 2005, the budget resolution called for cutting funding for environmental and natural resources programs in real (inflation-adjusted) terms by 10%.

2000 Vote #125 – April 13, 2000 – GOP Adopted Budget Resolution Conference Report That Called for Cutting Funding for Environmental Programs in Inflation-Adjusted Terms by 11% by 2005

In April 2000, House Republicans adopted – by a narrow margin of 220 to 208 – the GOP budget resolution conference report which called for a massive tax cut of up to \$175 billion over five years. Similar to the House-passed resolution, for FY 2001, the conference report calls for cutting funding for environmental and natural resources programs in real (inflation-adjusted) terms by \$600 million – or by 2%. Under the conference report, these cuts in purchasing power would grow over the next five years. By FY 2005, the conference report calls for cutting funding for environmental and natural resources programs in real (inflation-adjusted) terms by 11%. Furthermore, over five years, the GOP conference report provides \$9 billion less than the level of funding for environmental and natural resources programs in the Democratic substitute.

Votes on Environmental Bills

1999 Vote #16 – February 10, 1999 – GOP Rejected the Waxman “Defense of the Environment Act” Amendment

In February 1999, House Republicans rejected – by a narrow margin of 203 to 216 – the “Defense of the Environment” Act when it was offered as an amendment to the Mandates Information Act by Rep. Waxman. The Defense of the Environment Act would have required a separate debate and vote on anti-environmental policy riders – that is, provisions that would weaken or roll back health, safety, or environmental protections – on the House Floor.

The “Defense of the Environment” Act has been one of the top priorities of environmental groups over the last several years because, over and over again since Republicans took control of the House and Senate in 1995, legislation has been brought to the House Floor that contained provisions that would weaken environmental protection – without any identification of those provisions and without the opportunity for the House to analyze and debate the environmental impacts of those provisions. Examples of the anti-environmental policy riders slipped into House bills by Republicans in recent years have included: increasing clearcut logging in our national forests, blocking the regulation of radioactive contaminants in drinking water, stalling the Superfund program, delaying efforts to clean up air pollution in national parks, crippling the protection of endangered species, and preventing EPA from ensuring ground water is not contaminated by old nuclear facilities.

Under the Waxman “Defense of the Environment” Act amendment, these anti-environmental riders would have received a separate debate and vote – allowing full and open consideration by the House.

1999 Vote #19 – February 11, 1999 – GOP Rejected Kucinich Amendment To Ensure Compliance with Environmental Laws

Also in February 1999, House Republicans rejected – by a narrow margin of 210 to 214 – the Kucinich amendment on ensuring compliance with environmental laws. The underlying bill required federal agencies to waive penalties on small businesses for first-time violations of federal reporting requirements, including such requirements as reporting contaminants in drinking water. In an effort to ensure compliance with environmental and other key laws, the Kucinich amendment would have preserved agency discretion to pursue fines against intentional bad actors.

For example, under the guise of exempting first-time violators from fines for “paperwork” violations, the underlying bill could allow thousands of polluters to fail to report emissions of hazardous substances into a community’s air or water. The Kucinich amendment would have protected small businesses acting in good faith from penalties for inadvertent paperwork errors, but would have preserved agencies’ ability to fine deliberate violations of reporting requirements under the Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act, and other public health statutes. The Senate has never acted on the bill.

1999 Vote #281 – July 13, 1999 – A Majority of House Republicans Voted Against

McGovern Amendment to Provide Funding for State Grant Program Under the Land and Water Conservation Fund

In July 1999, 157 House Republicans voted against the McGovern amendment to the FY 2000 Interior Appropriations bill to provide funding for the state grant program under the Land and Water Conservation Fund – including all of the top GOP leaders (the Speaker usually does not vote) as follows: House Majority Leader Dick Armey, House Majority Whip Tom DeLay, House GOP Conference Chair J.C. Watts, and House Chief Deputy Majority Whip Roy Blunt. In 1964, Congress had established the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) to purchase public lands for open space and outdoor recreation, using revenues from offshore oil and gas drilling leases. In addition to funding land purchases for national parks, wildlife refuges, and forests throughout the country, LWCF had a state grant program, providing matching grants to states for the purchase, development, and improvement of open space and outdoor recreation areas.

However, one of the first acts of Republicans when they took control of Congress in 1995 was to zero out the state grant program. In 1999, like in their previous four Interior bills, House Republicans once again provided for zero funding for the state grant program in their FY 2000 Interior Appropriations bill and fought efforts on the Floor for funding to be restored. Fortunately, despite the opposition of the House GOP leadership, the McGovern amendment passed by a vote of 213 to 202 – with 157 Democrats, 55 Republicans, and 1 Independent voting YEA. The McGovern amendment restored \$30 million for the state grant program.

1999 Vote #288 – July 14, 1999 – A Majority of House Republicans Voted Against Rahall Amendment to Place Limits on Dumping of Hardrock Mining Waste

Also in July 1999, 143 Republicans voted against the Rahall amendment to the FY 2000 Interior Appropriations bill to place limits on the dumping of hardrock mining waste -- including all of the top GOP leaders (the Speaker usually does not vote) as follows: House Majority Leader Dick Armey, House Majority Whip Tom DeLay, House GOP Conference Chair J.C. Watts, and House Chief Deputy Majority Whip Roy Blunt.

In June 1999, Sen. Craig (R-ID), during the markup of the FY 2000 Interior Appropriations bill by the Senate Appropriations Committee, had been successful in adding the “Craig rider,” which would have legalized unlimited dumping of mining waste on public lands. Fortunately, when the House considered its version of the Interior Appropriations bill, a coalition of Democrats and moderate Republicans were successful in adding to the bill a provision designed to overturn “the Craig rider” – in passing the Rahall amendment which sought to place limits on the dumping of hardrock mining waste. Specifically, despite the opposition of the House GOP leadership, the Rahall amendment passed by a vote of 273 to 151 – with 194 Democrats, 78 Republicans, and 1 Independent voting YEA. Ultimately, in the omnibus appropriations bill signed by the President in November, the Craig rider was significantly scaled back.

1999 Vote #341 – July 27, 1999 – GOP Rejected The Visclosky Amendment To Delete Two Anti-Environmental Policy Riders on Wetlands Development from FY 2000 Energy-Water Appropriations Bill

Also in July 1999, House Republicans rejected – by a vote of 183 to 245 – an amendment offered by Rep. Visclosky (D-IN) to the FY 2000 Energy-Water Appropriations bill to delete two anti-environmental policy riders, both regarding wetlands development. The first wetlands rider permitted anyone who wanted to build on designated wetlands to contest the wetlands designation in federal court before finishing the permit process with the Corps of Engineers. Proponents of the Visclosky amendment argued that the rider would short-circuit the review process for wetlands permits and encourage litigation. The second wetlands rider allowed for the indefinite delay of the phase-out of the “permit 26” process for approving wetlands development. The Corps of Engineers was in the midst of a process of beginning a phase-out of the “permit 26” process – to be replaced with a new program that was designed to better protect wetlands, particularly flood plains and other environmentally sensitive areas. Proponents of the Visclosky amendment argued that the phase-out of the “permit 26” process should be allowed to continue. (Neither of these riders were in the final bill signed by the President in September.)

1999 Vote #528 – October 21, 1999 – GOP Adopted FY 2000 Interior Appropriations Conference Report, Containing A Number of Anti-Environmental Provisions

In October 1999, House Republicans adopted – by a vote of 225 to 200 – the conference report on H.R. 2466, the GOP FY 2000 Interior Appropriations bill. This GOP conference report contained numerous anti-environmental provisions, including significantly underfunding the Administration’s Lands Legacy Initiative. The Administration’s Lands Legacy Initiative is designed to fund public acquisition of a number of unique and ecologically important land parcels across the country which are in private hands – in order to add to the beauty and capacity of our National Parks and Forests. In addition, the GOP conference report contained several anti-environmental policy riders – including the following:

- ! Allowing unlimited dumping of “hard rock” mining waste on public lands;
- ! Allowing grazing on millions of acres of public rangelands without appropriate environmental reviews;
- ! Allowing the oil industry to avoid paying \$66 to \$100 million a year in royalties for drilling on public lands; and
- ! Subsidizing increased logging in Alaska’s Tongass National Forest.

Despite going on record in favor of an extremist approach to Interior funding, Republican leaders decided not to send this bill to the President’s desk. Finally, due to strong Democratic opposition to underfunding the Lands Legacy Initiative, significant funding was restored to the Initiative in the omnibus appropriations bill signed by the President in November. Similarly, due to strong Democratic opposition to the anti-environmental policy riders included in this conference report, most of these riders were either significantly watered down or completely removed in the omnibus appropriations bill signed by the President in November.

2000 Vote #238 – June 7, 2000 – GOP Adopted Substitute Weakening the Pro-Conservation Udall Amendment on Utah Lands Bill

On June 7, 2000, House Republicans adopted – by a narrow margin of 212 to 211 – a substitute offered by Rep. Boehlert (R-NY) to the Udall (D-CO) amendment, which was designed to significantly weaken the Udall amendment. The underlying bill would establish the 2.8 million-acre San Rafael Western Legacy District in Utah, to be managed by the Bureau of Land Management. It also would establish the 947,000-acre San Rafael national conservation area within the district – with the specific protections to apply within the conservation area to be developed later.

The Udall amendment was designed to improve the bill's conservation provisions by designating more than 1 million acres of the conservation area as wilderness study areas – significantly enhancing their protection. Instead of designating areas as wilderness study areas, the Boehlert substitute significantly weakened the Udall amendment by simply instructing the Interior Secretary to maintain at least the existing level of protection of lands in the conservation area, pending completion of a management plan.

2000 Vote #239 – June 7, 2000 – A Majority of House Republicans Voted Against the Pro-Conservation Inslee Amendment on Utah Lands Bill

Then on June 7, 189 Republicans voted against a pro-conservation amendment offered by Rep. Inslee (D-WA) that would expand the national conservation area created by the bill from 947,000 acres to 1,288,570 acres. Proponents of the Inslee amendment argued that these additional 341,570 acres needed to be included in the national conservation area both for their scenic beauty as well as for the protection of various endangered and threatened species who live in the area. Fortunately, despite the opposition of the majority of House Republicans, the Inslee amendment passed the House by a vote of 228 to 194 – with 204 Democrats, 23 Republicans, and 1 Independent voting YEA.

2000 Vote #240 – June 7, 2000 – A Majority of House Republicans Voted For Weakening the Pro-Conservation Holt Amendment on Utah Lands Bill

Later on June 7, 204 Republicans voted for the substitute offered by Boehlert (R-NY) to the Holt (D-NJ) amendment, which was designed to significantly weaken the Holt amendment. The Holt amendment would limit motorized vehicles within the conservation area created by the bill to those used for administrative purposes or emergencies. Instead of placing these significant limits on the use of motorized vehicles, the Boehlert substitute would have permitted the use of motorized vehicles wherever authorized by the Bureau of Land Management. Opponents of the Boehlert substitute argued that damage to these sensitive areas had already occurred with the current use of motorized vehicles and that this damage needed to be stopped. Fortunately, despite the support of the majority of House Republicans, the Boehlert substitute was defeated by a vote of 210 to 214 – with 204 Democrats, 9 Republicans, and 1 Independent voting NO. (When the Boehlert substitute was defeated, the House GOP leadership then pulled the bill from Floor consideration because they no longer supported the bill if the Holt amendment were added.)

2000 Vote #279 – June 15, 2000 – A Majority of House Republicans Voted to

Reinstate GOP Rider Blocking Columbia River Basin Ecosystem Management Project

This was the first in a series of key votes regarding the two most objectionable anti-environmental policy riders included in the GOP FY 2001 Interior Appropriations bill: 1) a GOP rider blocking the Columbia River Basin ecosystem management project; and 2) a GOP rider blocking funding for certain National Monuments (see Votes #280, 281, and 288 below).

On June 15, 2000, 202 House Republicans voted for the Nethercutt amendment to the Dicks amendment -- including all of the top GOP leaders (the Speaker usually does not vote), as follows: House Majority Leader Dick Armey, House Majority Whip Tom DeLay, House GOP Conference Chair J.C. Watts, and House Chief Deputy Majority Whip Roy Blunt. The Nethercutt amendment would have reinstated the GOP rider blocking completion of the Columbia River Basin ecosystem management project – a rider that the Dicks amendment was seeking to delete. (See Vote #281 below for a description of the Dicks amendment.) The Nethercutt amendment would have blocked the Columbia River Basin project after seven years of work and \$50 million invested in scientific analyses and public hearings. The amendment would thus have halted efforts to improve federal land management to protect rangeland, forestland, wildlife, and fish habitat. Despite the support of the House GOP leadership, the Nethercutt amendment was rejected by a vote of 206 to 221 – with 204 Democrats, 16 Republicans, and 1 Independent voting NO. However, on Vote #288 (see below), very late in the evening of June 15 (with many Members now absent), the House reversed itself and adopted the Nethercutt amendment.

2000 Vote #280 – June 15, 2000 – A Majority of House Republicans Voted to Reinstate GOP Rider Blocking Funding for Certain National Monuments

Later on June 15, 177 House Republicans voted for the Hansen amendment to the Dicks amendment -- including all of the top GOP leaders. The Hansen amendment would have reinstated the GOP rider blocking funding for all National Monuments designated by President Clinton since 1999. (See Vote #281 below for a description of the Dicks amendment.) The Hansen amendment was designed to undermine long-standing presidential authority to designate National Monuments under the Antiquities Act. It represented a back-door attempt to nullify nine recent National Monument designations, which the American public strongly endorsed, and to prevent future Presidents from moving decisively to protect and preserve other sites. Fortunately, despite the support of the House GOP leadership, the Hansen amendment was rejected by a vote of 187 to 234 – with 195 Democrats, 38 Republicans, and 1 Independent voting NO.

2000 Vote #281 – June 15, 2000 – A Majority of House Republicans Voted Against Dicks Amendment to Strip From Bill Rider Blocking Columbia River Basin Ecosystem Management Project & Rider Blocking Funding for Certain National Monuments

Later on June 15, 169 Republicans voted against the Dicks amendment that deleted from the bill the two key GOP anti-environmental policy riders: 1) the GOP rider blocking

completion of the Columbia River Basin ecosystem management project; and 2) the GOP rider prohibiting the use of funds for planning or management of all National Monuments designated by the President after 1999. The Dicks amendment was opposed by all of the top GOP leaders. Fortunately, despite the opposition of the House GOP leadership, the Dicks amendment was adopted by a vote of 243 to 177 – with 196 Democrats, 46 Republicans, and 1 Independent voting YEA.

2000 Vote #286 – June 15, 2000 – GOP Rejected Sanders Amendment Creating Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve

Later on June 15, House Republicans rejected – by a narrow margin of 193 to 195 – the Sanders (I-VT) amendment that would have created a Home Heating Oil Reserve in the Northeast. Proponents argued that aggressive steps were needed to be taken in order to ensure that the huge increases in home heating oil prices that were experienced during the winter of 1999-2000 did not happen again. They argued that creating a Home Heating Oil Reserve was one such step to address the problem of high home heating oil costs.

2000 Vote #288 – June 15, 2000 – Reversing Vote #279, GOP Adopted Nethercutt Amendment Blocking Columbia River Basin Ecosystem Management Project

Then, very late in the evening of June 15 (with 58 Members now absent) – by a narrow margin of 197 to 180 – the House reversed itself and adopted an amendment offered by Rep. Nethercutt that would block completion of the Columbia River Basin ecosystem management project. The Nethercutt amendment was supported by all of the top GOP leaders. As was noted above, the Nethercutt amendment would block the Columbia River Basin project after seven years of work and \$50 million invested in scientific analyses and public hearings. The amendment would thus halt efforts to improve federal land management to protect rangeland, forestland, wildlife, and fish habitat.

2000 Vote #291 – June 16, 2000 – GOP Passed FY 2001 Interior Appropriations Bill, Containing A Number of Anti-Environmental Provisions

In the early morning hours of June 16, House Republicans passed – by a vote of 204 to 172 – the FY 2001 Interior Appropriations bill. This bill is \$300 million below the FY 2000 appropriation and \$1.7 billion below the President's budget request. Several important programs are cut substantially below the President's request. For example, the GOP bill provides only \$184 million for the Administration's Lands Legacy Initiative – compared to the \$600 million requested by the Administration. This level of funding would undermine federal land conservation efforts to protect national treasures, such as the Everglades, California Desert, Lake Tahoe Basin, Giant Sequoia groves, Colorado Sand Dunes, and various Civil War Battlefields. The GOP bill also underfunds energy efficiency and energy conservation research – providing \$120 million less than the Administration's request. In addition, the bill contains a series of anti-environmental policy riders, including the rider blocking completion of the Columbia River Basin ecosystem management project that will protect rangeland, forestland, wildlife, and fish habitat.

2000 Vote #304 – June 21, 2000 – GOP Rejected Hinchey Amendment to Delete Two Key Anti-Environmental Policy Riders from VA-HUD-Independent Agencies

Appropriations Bill

On June 21, 2000, House Republicans rejected – by a narrow margin of 208 to 216 – the Hinchey amendment that would have deleted two key anti-environmental policy riders from the GOP FY 2001 VA-HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations bill. The two anti-environmental policy riders that would have been deleted from the GOP bill were: 1) a GOP rider intended to restrict EPA's ability to clean up contaminated sediment sites that pose a threat to public health and the environment; and 2) a GOP rider intended to prevent the EPA from establishing standards with regard to arsenic in drinking water.

2000 Vote #309 – June 21, 2000 – GOP Passed FY 2001 VA-HUD-Independent Agencies Bill, Containing A Number of Anti-Environmental Provisions

Finally, on June 21, 2000, House Republicans passed – by a vote of 256 to 169 – the GOP FY 2001 VA-HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations bill. This bill contained a number of anti-environmental provisions. For one thing, the bill cut the President's request by \$199 million for EPA environmental and public health programs. Unless reversed, a cut of this magnitude would seriously affect EPA's ability to provide American communities with cleaner water, cleaner air, and an improved quality of life. For another thing, the GOP bill contains such anti-environmental policy riders as one intended to restrict EPA's ability to clean up contaminated sediment sites that pose a threat to public health and the environment and one intended to prevent the EPA from developing standards for arsenic in drinking water.

KEY VOTES ON MANAGED CARE REFORM

1999 Vote #483 – October 6, 1999 – GOP Adopted Rigged Rule That Attached Phony “Health Access” Bill to Patients’ Bill of Rights

On October 6, 1999, House Republicans adopted – by a narrow margin of 221 to 209 – a rigged rule that provided for attaching a phony GOP “health access” bill (H.R. 2990) to the bipartisan Patients’ Bill of Rights (H.R. 2723), which the House GOP leadership vehemently opposed. (See Vote #485 below for a description of the GOP “health access” bill.) By adopting this highly unfair rule, the GOP leadership was implementing their strategy of attempting to undermine the chances of enactment of the bipartisan Patients’ Bill of Rights by attaching to it the “poison pill” provisions of the GOP “health access” bill (such as Medical Savings Accounts, Health Association Plans, and HealthMarts), which they knew President Clinton had promised to veto. As Democratic Caucus Chair Martin Frost pointed out, “This rule is a not-too-cleverly-disguised attempt by the Republican leadership to derail meaningful reforms in the managed care industry.”

1999 Vote #485 – October 6, 1999 – GOP Passed Phony “Health Access” Bill

Also on October 6, 1999, House Republicans passed – by a narrow margin of 227 to 205 – the phony GOP “health access” bill (H.R. 2990). The Republicans’ Phony Access bill would fail to provide access to health insurance to those who most need it and instead contains poison pill provisions in an effort to pander to Republican campaign contributors. For example, the GOP bill would expand Medical Savings Accounts – a special tax break for the healthy and wealthy that would threaten health insurance premiums for everyone else. The bill would also create Association Health Plans and HealthMarts – both of which would offer cheaper/less comprehensive policies that bypass state consumer protection requirements. As the Washington Post (10/5/99) stated, “The Republican leadership continues to play a game with the issue. ... In the name of increasing access to care, Republicans ... seem bent on adding some poison pills to the bill, in the form of proposals that would make it easier for healthier people who could afford the risk to opt out of the broader insurance pool. But the effect would be to drive up costs for those most in need of coverage who would be left, thereby in the end reducing access.”

1999 Vote #490 – October 7, 1999 – A Majority of House Republicans Voted Against The Strong, Enforceable Norwood-Dingell Patients’ Bill of Rights

Then on October 7, 1999, 149 House Republicans voted against the strong, enforceable Norwood-Dingell Patients’ Bill of Rights – including all of the top GOP leaders (the Speaker usually does not vote), as follows: House Majority Leader Dick Armey, House Majority Whip Tom DeLay, House GOP Conference Chair J.C. Watts, and House Chief Deputy Majority Whip Roy Blunt. The Norwood-Dingell Patients’ Bill of Rights would provide a comprehensive set of strong, enforceable patient protections, including ensuring that medical decisions are made by doctors and patients and not insurance company

bureaucrats; ensuring direct access to specialists; ensuring continuity of care; and making plans accountable for decisions that lead to serious injury or death. Fortunately, despite the opposition of the GOP leadership, the Norwood-Dingell bill passed by a vote of 275 to 151 – with 206 Democrats, 68 Republicans, and 1 Independent voting YEA. However, the House and Senate GOP leadership have spent the last 11 months busily trying to kill this strong, enforceable bill in the conference committee.

1999 Vote #558 – November 2, 1999 – A Majority of House Republicans Voted Against Instructing Conferees to Insist on the Strong, Enforceable Provisions of Norwood-Dingell in Conference

On November 2, 1999, 165 House Republicans voted against a Dingell motion to instruct House conferees to the Managed Care Reform conference committee to insist upon the provisions of the strong, enforceable Norwood-Dingell Patients' Bill of Rights, despite the fact that the Norwood-Dingell bill was passed by the House by the strong, bipartisan vote of 275 to 151 on October 7, 1999. The Senate-passed managed care "reform" bill – passed by the Senate by the narrow vote of 53 to 47 on July 15, 1999 with no Democratic votes – was a sham bill, containing very watered-down patient protections and failing to contain any provisions to hold health plans accountable. Fortunately, despite the opposition of the GOP leadership, the Dingell motion was adopted by a vote of 257 to 167 – with 204 Democrats, 52 Republicans, and 1 Independent voting YEA.

2000 Vote #6 – February 1, 2000 – A Majority of House Republicans Voted Against Instructing Conferees to Begin Meetings of Conference Committee & Insist on the Strong, Enforceable Provisions of Norwood-Dingell

Finally, on February 1, 2000, 173 Republicans voted against a Berry motion to instruct House conferees to "take all necessary steps" to begin meetings of the conference and to insist upon the provisions of the strong, enforceable Norwood-Dingell Patients' Bill of Rights. The Berry motion was adopted by a vote of 207 to 175 – with 200 Democrats, 6 Republicans, and 1 Independent voting YEA. Republicans voted against this motion despite the fact that the House and Senate GOP leadership were using the strategy of **delay, delay, delay** to kill strong, enforceable reform – with the conference committee having been appointed on November 2, 1999 and yet no meetings of the conference yet scheduled as of February 1!! Since February 1, the House and Senate GOP leadership have continued to appear to be convinced that, by dragging out the conference committee process, they could succeed in killing strong, enforceable reform. Indeed, since February, the conference committee – chaired by Senate Majority Whip Don Nickles – has only met twice – and appears to have now ended in failure.

KEY VOTES ON MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION COVERAGE

2000 Vote #114 – April 10, 2000 – GOP Rejected Instructing Conferees to Require Enactment of Medicare Prescription Coverage for Seniors BEFORE Enactment of Tax Cuts

On April 10, 2000, House Republicans rejected the Spratt motion to instruct conferees on the FY 2001 budget resolution – a budget resolution calling for massive tax cuts of up to \$200 billion over the next five years. The Spratt motion would have instructed conferees to insist that the House Ways and Means Committee not report its tax cuts before September 22 -- allowing Congress enough time to enact legislation to establish a real, voluntary, affordable and reliable prescription drug benefit for all seniors under the Medicare program. The Spratt motion to instruct reflected the priorities of the American people – i.e., it required that enacting a Medicare prescription drug benefit come BEFORE tax cuts. Unfortunately, virtually the entire GOP Conference chose tax cuts over a Medicare prescription drug benefit. The Spratt motion was rejected by the narrow vote of 198 to 201 – with only 5 Republicans joining 192 Democrats and 1 Independent in voting AYE.

2000 Vote # 356 – June 28, 2000 – GOP Rejected Democratic Plan for Affordable, Reliable Prescription Coverage for Seniors Under the Medicare Program

On June 28, 2000, House Republicans rejected – by a narrow margin of 204 to 222 – a motion to recommit the sham GOP prescription coverage bill and replace it with the Democratic plan that would provide a real, voluntary, affordable, and reliable drug benefit under Medicare for all seniors that would bring prescription costs down (H.R. 4770). Under the Democratic plan, Medicare would pay up to half of beneficiaries' costs up to \$2,000 in 2003, increasing to \$5,000 in 2009. The Democratic plan would also begin catastrophic coverage in 2003, once a beneficiary's out-of-pocket costs reached \$4,000. Finally, the measure would require private benefit providers to negotiate lower drug prices for seniors, giving seniors the same benefits that other large purchasing groups (like HMOs) currently get.

2000 Vote #357 – June 28, 2000 – GOP Adopted Sham GOP Prescription Coverage Bill, Providing Incentives to Private Insurers to Offer Prescription Drug-Only Policies

Also, on June 28, 2000, House Republicans passed – by a narrow margin of 217 to 214 – their sham prescription coverage bill (H.R. 4680) – a proposal strongly supported by big drug companies that claim that the Democratic proposal for Medicare coverage of prescription drugs would lead to unfair reductions in prescription drug prices. Rather than offering seniors affordable prescription coverage through the Medicare program, the GOP plan would provide subsidies to private insurance companies to offer prescription drug-only policies to seniors. One critical problem with the sham GOP proposal is that private insurance companies themselves say it won't work. For example, as recently as June 13,

Chip Kahn, head of the Health Insurance Association of America stated, “We continue to believe that the concept of so-called drug-only private insurance would not work in practice.” Furthermore, the GOP prescription coverage bill would do nothing to make prescription drugs more affordable for middle-income seniors.

2000 Vote #391 – July 12, 2000 – GOP Rejected Motion Requiring Enactment of Medicare Prescription Coverage for Seniors BEFORE Enactment of Marriage Penalty Relief

Finally, on July 12, 2000, House Republicans rejected – by a vote of 197 to 230 – a motion to recommit H.R. 4810, Marriage Penalty Relief, to committee with instructions to add language that would ensure that enactment of marriage penalty relief not go into effect until a real, voluntary, affordable and reliable prescription drug benefit for all seniors under Medicare has been enacted into law. In voting against this motion, Republicans were voting against putting first things first – against putting strengthening and modernizing Medicare through the addition of a prescription drug benefit first, ahead of large tax cuts.

KEY VOTES ON MINIMUM WAGE

2000 Vote #39 – March 9, 2000 – GOP Adopted Rigged Rule That Attached Massive GOP Special-Interest Tax Cut Package to Minimum Wage Increase

On March 9, 2000, House Republicans adopted – by a narrow margin of 214 to 211 – a rigged rule that provided for attaching a massive \$123-billion GOP special-interest tax cut package (H.R. 3081) to the minimum wage increase bill (H.R. 3846). By adopting this highly unfair rule, the GOP leadership was implementing their strategy of holding a minimum wage increase hostage to an enormous tax cut package designed to help their special-interest friends – a package that President Clinton has always made clear that he would veto. Furthermore, this unfair GOP rule denied Democrats the opportunity to offer a substitute to the GOP special-interest tax cut bill (with the substitute then being offered in a motion to recommit the tax bill; see vote #40 below).

2000 Vote #40 – March 9, 2000 – GOP Rejected Motion to Recommit The GOP Special-Interest Tax Cut Bill with Instructions to Replace with Democratic Substitute

Then, on March 9, House Republicans rejected – by a narrow margin of 207 to 218 – a motion to recommit the GOP special-interest tax cut package (H.R. 3081) to committee with instructions to replace the bill with the Democratic substitute. Despite GOP claims to the contrary, the GOP tax cut bill had almost nothing to do with providing tax relief to small businesses impacted by a minimum wage increase. Indeed, \$98 billion of the GOP's \$123 billion in tax cuts over ten years were not targeted to small businesses. By contrast, the Democratic substitute would have provided \$32 billion in tax relief for small businesses over ten years, including an increase to \$30,000 in the amount of investment that can be written off as an expense rather than depreciated over time for small businesses, a permanent extension of the Work Opportunity Tax Credit and the Welfare-to-Work Tax Credit, and 100% deductibility of health insurance for the self-employed beginning in 2001. Hence, the Democratic substitute would have provided more tax relief for small businesses (\$32 billion over ten years) than the GOP bill (\$25 billion over ten years).

2000 Vote #43 – March 9, 2000 – A Majority of House Republicans Voted Against The Traficant Amendment Providing A One-Dollar Increase in Minimum Wage Over Two Years, Rather Than Three

Then, on March 9, 173 House Republicans voted against the Traficant amendment to provide a one-dollar increase in the minimum wage over two years instead of over three years, as in the underlying GOP bill (H.R. 3846). In his 1998, 1999, and 2000 State of the Union Addresses, President Clinton had requested a one-dollar increase in the minimum wage over two years. In 1998 and 1999, the House GOP leadership had simply refused to bring a minimum wage increase bill to the House Floor. Now when they finally brought a bill to the Floor in March 2000, the GOP leadership brought a bill that attempted to shortchange minimum-wage workers by spreading the one-dollar increase over three years instead of two. Under the GOP proposal, a full-time worker would lose \$1,000 over three years. Fortunately, the Traficant amendment was adopted by a vote of 246 to 179 – with

203 Democrats, 42 Republicans, and 1 Independent voting YEA.

2000 Vote #45 – March 9, 2000 – A Majority of House Republicans Voted Against A Bill Providing A One-Dollar Increase In the Minimum Wage Over Two Years

Finally, on March 9, 137 House Republicans voted against the minimum wage bill (H.R. 3846) as amended by the Traficant amendment – including all of the top GOP leaders (the Speaker usually does not vote) as follows: House Majority Leader Dick Armey, House Majority Whip Tom DeLay, House GOP Conference Chair J.C. Watts, and House Chief Deputy Majority Whip Roy Blunt. As amended by the Traficant amendment, the bill provided a one-dollar increase in the minimum wage – from \$5.15 an hour to \$6.15 an hour – over two years. Fortunately, despite the votes of a majority of House Republicans, the minimum wage bill passed by a vote of 282 to 143 – with 203 Democrats, 78 Republicans, and 1 Independent voting YEA. However, due to the rigged GOP rule adopted earlier (see Vote #39 above), the GOP \$123-billion, special-interest tax cut package, which President Clinton has promised to veto, was attached to the minimum wage increase before it was sent over to the Senate. As a result, over the last six months, the House and Senate GOP leadership have been holding the minimum wage increase (which they all oppose) hostage to their massive, special-interest tax cut package.

KEY ANTI-CRIME VOTES

Votes on Budget Plans

1999 Vote #76 – March 25, 1999 – GOP Rejected Democratic Substitute Budget Resolution That Called for \$35 Billion More for Law Enforcement Than GOP Budget Over 10 Years

In March 1999, House Republicans rejected – by a vote of 173 to 250 – the Democratic substitute budget resolution. This Democratic budget resolution did not include the Republicans' damaging cuts in law enforcement programs. Instead, the Democratic budget resolution called for \$35 billion more for law enforcement programs over ten years than the Republican budget.

1999 Vote #77 – March 25, 1999 – GOP Adopted Budget Resolution That Called for Cutting Law Enforcement Funding in Inflation-Adjusted Terms by 29% by 2009

In March 1999, House Republicans adopted – by a narrow margin of 221 to 208 – the Republican budget resolution which called for a massive \$778 billion tax cut over a ten-year period. To pay for their massive tax cut, Republicans called for significant cuts in investments in key domestic priorities – including law enforcement. Specifically, the GOP budget resolution called for cutting law enforcement funding in real (inflation-adjusted) terms by 18% by the year FY 2005 and by an astounding 29% by the year FY 2009. The budget resolution's decreased funding for law enforcement programs would force such agencies as the FBI, Drug Enforcement Administration, and INS to significantly cut their current level of services.

1999 Vote #85 – April 14, 1999 – GOP Adopted Budget Resolution Conference Report That Also Called for Cutting Law Enforcement Funding in Inflation-Adjusted Terms by 29% by 2009

In April 1999, House Republicans adopted – by a narrow margin of 220 to 208 – the Republican budget resolution conference report which also called for a massive \$778 billion tax cut over a ten-year period. Once again, to pay for this tax cut, Republicans called for significant cuts in investments in key domestic priorities – including law enforcement. Specifically, like the House-passed resolution, the conference report called for cutting law enforcement funding in real (inflation-adjusted terms) by 18% by the year FY 2005 and by an astounding 29% by the year FY 2009.

2000 Vote #74 – March 23, 2000 – GOP Rejected Democratic Substitute Budget Resolution That Called for \$11 Billion More for Law Enforcement Than GOP Budget Over 5 Years

In 2000, the Republicans proposed a five-year budget resolution rather than the ten-year budget plan they proposed in 1999 (probably in order to make the GOP tax cut sound smaller, since the ten-year \$778 billion GOP tax cut passed and vetoed in 1999 had proved unpopular with the public).

In March 2000, House Republicans rejected – by a vote of 184 to 233 – the Democratic substitute budget resolution. The Democratic budget resolution called for \$1.1 billion more for law enforcement in FY 2001 than the Republican budget. Over five years, the Democratic plan would have invested \$11 billion more in law enforcement than the Republicans. The funding would have provided for investments in expanding resources at such key agencies as the FBI, Drug Enforcement Administration, and the INS.

2000 Vote #75 – March 23, 2000 – GOP Adopted Budget Resolution That Called for Cutting Law Enforcement Funding in Inflation-Adjusted Terms by 9% by 2005

Also in March 2000, House Republicans adopted – by a narrow margin of 211 to 207 – the Republican budget resolution which called for a massive tax cut of up to \$200 billion over the next five years. For FY 2001, the budget resolution called for cutting law enforcement funding in real (inflation-adjusted) terms by \$700 million – or by 2.4%. Under the budget resolution, these cuts in purchasing power would grow over the five years. By FY 2005, the budget resolution called for cutting law enforcement funding in real (inflation-adjusted) terms by 9%. Under this GOP cut, by FY 2005, the FBI would be forced to cut 1,100 agents; the DEA would be forced to cut 900 agents; the INS would be forced to cut 1,781 border agents; and the Customs Service would be forced to cut 752 drug and criminal enforcement agents.

2000 Vote #125 – April 13, 2000 – GOP Adopted Budget Resolution Conference Report That Called for Cutting Law Enforcement Funding in Inflation-Adjusted Terms by 6% by 2005

In April 2000, House Republicans adopted – by a narrow margin of 220 to 208 – the GOP budget resolution conference report which called for a massive tax cut of up to \$175 billion over the next five years. Like the House-passed resolution, for FY 2001, the conference report called for cutting law enforcement funding in real (inflation-adjusted) terms by \$700 million – or by 2.4%. Under the conference report, these cuts in purchasing power would grow over the five years. By FY 2005, the conference report calls for cutting law enforcement funding in real (inflation-adjusted) terms by 6%. Furthermore, over five years, the GOP conference report provides \$8 billion less than the level of law enforcement funding in the Democratic substitute.

Votes on Law Enforcement Appropriations Bills

1999 Vote #386 – August 5, 1999 – GOP Rejected Recommitting Appropriations Bill With Instructions to Add \$1 Billion to Bring Funding for the COPS Program Up to the President's Request

On August 5, 1999, House Republicans rejected – by a narrow margin of 208 to 219 – a motion to recommit H.R. 2670, the GOP Commerce-Justice-State appropriations bill to committee with instructions to add \$1 billion to bring the funding for the COPS program up to the President's request of \$1.3 billion for FY 2000. The COPS program, begun in 1994 under a Democratic Congress, has been one of the most successful federal programs ever created – having helped local communities fund an additional 100,000 community police officers between 1995 and 1999. In 1999, President Clinton requested \$1.3 billion as the first installment in a five-year extension of the COPS program – in order to help local communities fund yet another 50,000 officers. However, the GOP bill provided only \$325 million for the COPS program for FY 2000 – providing for it to wind down and expire.

1999 Vote #387 – August 5, 1999 – GOP Passed FY 2000 Commerce-Justice-State Appropriations Bill Which Gutted the COPS Program

Then on August 5, 1999, House Republicans – by a narrow margin of 217 to 210 – passed H.R. 2670, the GOP Commerce-Justice-State appropriations bill for FY 2000. As was noted above (see Vote #386), this GOP bill failed to provide the \$1.3 billion requested by President Clinton to extend the highly-successful COPS program – providing only \$325 million instead. The COPS program had already successfully helped fund 100,000 additional community police officers across the country. The \$1.3 billion was the first installment in the President's proposed extension of the COPS program to fund an additional 50,000 new community police officers over the next five years. By contrast, the \$325 million included in the GOP bill simply provided for the COPS program to wind down and expire.

1999 Vote #518 – October 20, 1999 – GOP Adopted Conference Report on FY 2000 Commerce-Justice-State Appropriations Bill Which Gutted the COPS Program

On October 20, 1999, House Republicans – by a narrow margin of 217 to 214 – adopted the conference report on H.R. 2670, the GOP FY 2000 Commerce-Justice-State Appropriations bill. Like the House-passed bill, this GOP conference report failed to provide the \$1.3 billion requested by President Clinton to extend the highly-successful COPS program – providing only \$325 million instead. (See Vote #387 above.) (The President vetoed this conference report on October 25, 1999. The omnibus appropriations bill signed by the President on November 29, 1999 ultimately restored most of the funding for the COPS program requested by the President.)

2000 Vote #326 – June 26, 2000 – GOP Passed FY 2001 Commerce-Justice-State Appropriations Bill Which Fails to Fully Fund the COPS Program

In June 2000, House Republicans passed – by a vote of 214 to 195 – H.R. 4690, the GOP FY 2001 Commerce-Justice-State Appropriations bill. This GOP bill would provide only \$495 million of the \$1.3 billion requested by the President for the highly-effective COPS program for FY 2001. The level provided by the GOP would jeopardize the President's goal of funding up to 50,000 additional community police officers by FY 2005. The level provided by the GOP would also defund the community prosecutors program and seriously underfund the technology initiatives designed to give law enforcement the tools needed to fight crime in the 21st century, included in the President's \$1.3 billion request for the COPS program.

KEY VOTES ON CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

1999 Vote #422 – September 14, 1999 – A Majority of House Republicans Voted Against Shays-Meehan Campaign Finance Reform (House Version of “McCain-Feingold”)

In September 1999, 164 Republicans voted against the strong, meaningful Shays-Meehan Campaign Finance Reform bill – including all of the top GOP leaders (the Speaker usually does not vote) as follows: House Majority Leader Dick Armey, House Majority Whip Tom DeLay, House GOP Conference Chair J.C. Watts, and House Chief Deputy Majority Whip Roy Blunt. The Shays-Meehan Bipartisan Campaign Finance Reform bill – very similar to the McCain-Feingold Bipartisan Campaign Finance Reform bill in the Senate – contains provisions to ban “soft money” (i.e., the unlimited contributions from wealthy individuals and corporations to political parties). It also contains provisions to place new restrictions on the use of “issue ads.” Fortunately, despite the opposition of the House GOP leadership, the Shays-Meehan bill passed by a vote of 252 to 177 – with 197 Democrats, 54 Republicans, and 1 Independent voting YEA. Despite the passage of Shays-Meehan, the Senate GOP leadership has spent the last year blocking passage of similar legislation in the Senate.

2000 Vote #232 – May 25, 2000 – GOP Rejected Recommitting Telephone Tax Repeal With Instructions to Add Provisions Requiring Disclosure by Secretive Section 527 Political Groups

In May 2000, House Republicans – by a narrow margin of 202 to 216 – rejected a Doggett motion to recommit H.R. 3916, Telephone Tax Repeal, to committee with instructions to promptly report the bill back to the House adding Section 527 Disclosure provisions. Under Section 527 of the Internal Revenue Code, political organizations identified as “527’s” could operate without disclosing who they were and collect unlimited contributions from anonymous, undisclosed sources. The Section 527 Disclosure provisions that Rep. Doggett sought to add to the bill would require “Section 527” organizations to adhere to basic disclosure requirements, including the disclosure of donors. And yet House Republicans voted against these basic disclosure requirements.

2000 Vote #253 – June 9, 2000 – GOP Rejected Recommitting Estate Tax Repeal With Instructions to Add Provisions Requiring Disclosure by Secretive Section 527 Political Groups

Once again, in June 2000, House Republicans – by a narrow margin of 202 to 216 – rejected a Doggett motion to recommit H.R. 8, Estate Tax Repeal, to committee with instructions to promptly report the bill back to the House adding Section 527 Disclosure provisions. The Section 527 Disclosure provisions that Rep. Doggett sought to add to the bill were basically the same provisions that Sen. John McCain (R-AZ) and Sen. Joe Lieberman (D-CT) had successfully passed in the Senate on June 8 as an amendment to the DOD Authorization bill. The McCain-Lieberman provisions would require “Section 527”

organizations to adhere to basic disclosure requirements, including the disclosure of donors. And yet House Republicans voted against these basic disclosure requirements, despite the fact that they were being championed in the Senate by Republican Senator John McCain.

2000 Vote #341 – June 28, 2000 – Under Political Pressure, House Republicans Finally Reversed Themselves and Helped Pass Bill Requiring Disclosure by Secretive Section 527 Political Groups

Finally, on June 28, 2000, under enormous political pressure, Republicans reversed themselves and voted along with Democrats in favor of Section 527 Disclosure legislation (H.R. 4762) that they had opposed in May and earlier in June (see Votes #232 and #253). The House passed the bill by an overwhelming vote of 385 to 39. This Section 527 Disclosure bill would require “Section 527” organizations to adhere to basic disclosure requirements. Specifically, the bill would require 527 organizations to report their existence to the IRS, file publicly available tax returns, and make public reports specifying annual expenditures of over \$500 to any person and identifying those who contribute more than \$200 annually to the organization. These provisions were very similar to the McCain-Lieberman provisions passed by the Senate on June 8. Once it was passed by the House on June 28, H.R. 4762 was passed by the Senate on June 29 and was signed by the President on July 1.